

Remarks

The present communication responds to the Office Action mailed November 17, 2005. The Response addresses each of the issues raised in the Action. Pending claims 1 through 8 are allowable.

Objection to specification.

The action objects to the Abstract as being too lengthy. Applicant has amended the Abstract to reduce its length. The objection to the specification should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections 35 USC §102.

The Action rejects claims 1 and 2 as being anticipated by Miller. Applicant respectfully disagrees that Miller anticipates claim 1. Miller concerns a dowel and method of using a dowel. As made clear in Miller, the dowel is used to quickly and easily connect two or more adjoining components. To adjoin the two or more components, Miller discloses using a multi-diametered peg-like structure 10. The Miller dowel joins the components by inserting the dowel 10 into a corresponding multi-diametered aperture extending through two adjoining components 30, 34.

Miller does not disclose or address the configuration of or use of a valve pin insert.

Applicant's valve pin, in contrast to Miller, does not join two adjoining components. The valve pin is an anchor affixed to a valve plate. The valve pin insert serves to help retain a valve. The valve plate is not comprised of two adjoining components. The valve pin insert thus does not serve to join two adjoining components.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to emphasize that it concerns a valve pin insert. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite an insert position wherein in said insert position, said valve pin insert is disposed in a valve plate. As Miller does not disclose utilizing a dowel in a valve plate, it does not anticipate claim 1. Additionally, as Miller discloses utilizing the dowel to join two

adjoining members, one would not consider using the structure of Miller as a valve pin insert to anchor a valve.

Applicant also disagrees that Miller discloses a tooth that shears material. Miller, at Fig. 4b does disclose elements 17. However, the elements 17 are not described as teeth for shearing material. They are merely described as an alternative structure to be used for appropriate application. The anticipation rejection to claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections 35 USC §103

The Action rejects the dependent claims as being unpatentable over Miller as applied to claim 1, and in view of certain other references. Applicant has explained why Miller does not have all of the features set forth in claim 1. The cited references are not put forth as disclosing these features. They do not disclose these features. The obviousness rejection to claims 3-8 should be withdrawn.

FEB. 17. 2006 11:04AM

BARNES & THORNBURG

NO. 188 P. 7

Serial No. 10/752,651

-7-

Atty Docket No. 926512-101092

Conclusion

Claims 1 through 8 are pending. The present communication amends claim 1. The claims are now all in allowable condition. A Notice of Allowance should now issue.

Friday, February 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,


James B. Conte
Barnes & Thornburg LLP
P.O. Box 2786
Chicago, IL 60690
(312) 214-4805

Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 54,661

CMDS01 JCONTE 318729v1